SOME NEW BOOKS.

The Binry of George M. Bdilas, Nowadays If an American Minister were to pen a record of his observations and impressions of European society, the performance would provoke a smile. Everybody goes to Europe, and any respectable American can be presented at any court. It is, indeed, questionable whether any American Minister now sees a tenth part so much of society in any European capital as do some of his compatriot not occupying official positions. The case was otherwise fifty and even thirty years ago. As late as 1830 the proportion of native Americans who were thoroughly conversant with Europe was small, and those who knew anything of the Russian or the English court might have been reckened on the fingers of one hand. When, consequently, GEORGE MIFFLIN DALLAS went to Russia as United States Minister in 1837, and to London In the same capacity in 1850, he was likely to see and hear things worth recording, though does not appear that the Diary, now published by the Lippincotts, was intended for any other eyes than those of his own family.

There is, indeed, a special reason why this

journal, interesting in itself, should be given to the world; namely, that the two periods with which it deals were of exceptional historical importance. The three years, 1836-30, which Mr. Dallas spont at St. Petersburg were contemporaneous with the rapid military development of Turkey's great Egypvassal, and immediately preceded the stronuous diplomatic contest tween England and France which, has M. Thiers carried his point, must have resulted in the dissolution of the Ottoman empire When Mr. Dallas was presented to Czar Nicholas, the latter was still lamenting the failure of a Russian General to seize Constantinople a few years before when the prize lay in his grasp, and the autocrat was already planning renewed demonstrations on the Lower Danube, which, as it turned out, were post poned until the eve of the Crimean war, but would have taken place in 1840 had not England rescued the Sultan from invasion and probable deposition at the hands of Ihrahim Pasha. Fraught with still deeper interest for American readers is the period from December, 1857, to May 15, 1861, during which Mr. Dallas was the American Minister at the court of St. James. These, of course, were the years which witnessed the Inception and outbreak of the rebellion. Indeed, Mr. Dallas did not leave his post until two months after Mr. Lin coin's inauguration, when he was succeeded by Mr. Adams. The portion, therefore, of his Diary relating to England reflects like a mir ror the attitude of London society toward the United States at the beginning of our civil war.

The Russian section of this Diary is full of anecdotes, some of which are well worth reproducing, for there were many persons living in St. Petersburg who had taken part in the wars of 1812-14, and even the traditions about Catherine II. were still Iresh. The author of the Diary heard, for instance, an exempli fication, though he does not vouch for its au thenticity, of the political finesse of the great Empress. It is well known that Charles James Fox long showed himself very hostile to Rus sin and its sovereign in the House o Commons. It chanced one day that Catherine II. gave a large entertain ment at the Hermitage, to which she in rited several distinguished Englishmen, who happened to be in St. Petersburg at the time In one of the rooms had been placed a plaster cast of Fox, which was surrounded by bust of Cloero, Demosthenes, and other great masters of eloquence. It was in this apartmen and near the busts that the Empress seated herself to play at whist. In the course of the evening her English guests sauntered into her neighborhood, and seeing the cast, ex-pressed aloud to each other their surprise. The Empress frowned, listened for a moment and then said to them: "What! Gentlemen are you surprised to see that bust in the mids of the greatest orators? Do you think me incapable of doing justice to an enemy? can give Mr. Fox the rank to which his won derful ability entitles him even while I suffer under its exertions." These words were naturally reported to Fox, who soon afterward became the Parliamentary friend and eulogist of Catherine. Not unnaturally, also, the plas ter cast soon gave way to one of marble and another of bronze.

There were many stories current at the time of Mr. Dallas's sojourn in St. Petersburg about the Czar, Alexander I., and his experiences in France. We are reminded that when the allies entered Paris in 1814, the Emperor Alexander used to separate himself from his staff, and in a spirit of confidence, born of his good intentions toward the French people.was wont to ride alone and in advance. I is not generally known, however, that on one on he was stopped by a knot of poissardes, one of whom stepped forward and ture sented him with a handsome bouquet flowers, saying that he was the only one of the invading sovereigns whom they liked. know from the historians that during his stay at Paris Alexander was in the habit of visiting the Empress Josephine Malmaison, and that he interposed at the Congress of Vienna in behalf of her son. Eugene Beauharnais. Mr. Dallas was told that when one day driving out to see the ex-Empress in his carriage, with four horses abreast and galloping as usual. Alexander met a French officer with a fine curriele and The Frenchman would not yield the road, but cried out, "Give way! Give way! and the consequence was that when the two equipages encountered the curricle was over urged and broken to pieces, its horses knocked down and much wounded, and their owner thrown out and rendered perfectly furious with rage. The Emporer alighted immediately, begged the officer's pardon, hoped he was not hurt, and ascribed the disaster to the carelessness of his coachman. "No!" was the re "You are doubtless one of those who have conquered our capital, and you think to ride rough shod over us; but I will not submit to such indignities and wrongs. I demand the satisfaction due to an insulted man. There is my address, and I expect to see you by 11 o'clock to-morrow morning." "Agreed." said his Majesty: "you shall be satisfied." Early the next day the Emperor sent Gen. Kissi lieff to the Frenchman with a splendid curricle and two of his finest horses, requesting him to accept them in lieu of the injured ones. At first the Frenchman haughtily declined, saying that he awaited the personal presence of Gen. Kissilieff's friend and associate, and would receive nothing but the satisfaction of an apology or a duel. He was thunderstruck says Mr. Soltikoff, and overwhelmed when Kissilieff replied: "That is impossible. My friend is his Majesty, the Emperor of Russia."

Among other interesting personages of the Napoleonic spoch, whom we encounter in this Diary, was Sir James Wylle, who throughout the reigns of Paul and Alexander I. had been court surgeon. Surmising that he had probably been with the Russian armies in Germany, Mr. Dallas asked him where he was when Moreau was killed at Dresden. "Close by him." was the reply, "and it was I who amputated both legs at the thigh." James then went on to recount the particulars of the event. It seems that Moreau's first exclamation to him was. "Qu'il est fachenx. Mon cher Docteur, que ce misérable (Napoleon), m'a attrapé ici." His attendan's were obliged to move Moreau about a good deal in order to get him into a place of safety, but Sir James thought that the operation had been so fortunate that he would have survived, had not Metternich and the Duke of Cumberland tafterward King of Hanoversthrown him into a fever by prolonged political conversations. Another survivor of the wars of 1812-14 whom Mr. Dallas met was Prince Hohen ohe. Beferring to the cold and impenetrable forms of intercourse at St. Petersburg, the Prince deat a state of things existed in preserve, however disgraceful, the usages tal which was to be found nowhere and traditions of medieval barbarism. Thus Europe. "I have been at this it is that extremes meet." We are glad to clared that a state of things existed in that ce lital which was to be found nowhere

"for thirteen years; married a Russian lady: constantly in society, and have probably become acquainted with 500 or 600 persons: but I do not know one Russian intimately, one whom I can rely on as a friend." Mr. Dallas said that he had supposed such a situation peculiar to Americans, for the reason that they had no titles and no order of nobility, which in Europe were the marks of social distinction. The Prince rejoined: "Not so, not so, it is the case with every stranger who enters Russia, let his titles and rank be what they may. Come to Wartemberg, come into any part of central Europe, and I will engage that you make intimate triendships by scores.' It was the same Prince Hohenlohe who narrated the following anecdote: It appears that some ten or twelve years before Jerome Bonaparte, then called Count de Montfort, at a soirée of his own, played cards with great vehemence. He lost all the money he had about him, then pledged his rings, and finally laid his watch upon the table. It was a small gold one, the back of which opened by a spring. lady, overlooking the game, admired the watch, and took it up to examine. On her attempting to open the back, Jerome Immediately clasped it, and said that must not be done. His wife, who stood by in Princess of Wurtemberg), insisted upon knowing what was in it, grew angry, represented him with having some keepsake of a favor to there, and finally bursting into tears, quit the room. Jerom then opened the watch, and showed to all present that it contained a beautiful miniature of his first wife (Betsey Patterson), with the remark: "You see, I hope, that I could not with propriety let her look at it." Prince Hohenlohe said that it was notorious that Jerome Bonaparte remained deeply attached to his first wife long after their separation. Elsewhere we find in the Diary an amus-

ing lliustration of the paternal nature of the Government administered by Nicholas I. It seems that the Czar one day met a young man named Meyendorff with a companion near the Boulevards. He was on horseback; they were on foot. Having long been absent from Russia, the young men did not know the person of he sovereign, and, of course, omitted the cusomary bow. His Maiesty immediately dismounted, went up to them. and reprimanded them sternly. They in vain pleaded their ignorance of his face and figure. He ordered them o proceed forthwith to the guard house, and ipon their remaining stationary, not knowing where the guard house was, he called up a entinel and directed him to accompany them o the prison. They were extremely plarmed. wept bitterly, and were immured for some hours in a wretched cell. At the expiration of that time a guard announced to them that the Emperor had ordered them to be escorted to the Anischkoff Palace. They went, expecting little short of Siberia or decapitation. When at the palace, they were stationed near of one of the spartments, and then left to themselves. They were surprised to notice that several young ladies now and then popped their heads in at the door. and, looking at them for an instant, retreated laughing. At last the Emperor came in, and, walking toward them, said: "Young gentle men, you have had lesson enough for the present. I am sure that you will know me here after, wherever you may see me. And now, to remove the impressions of the day, come and dine with my family and myself."

TIT. It was about twenty years after his sojour at St. Petersburg that Mr. Dallas, who meanwhile had been Vice-President, was sent as American Minister to the Court of St. James's The Indian mutiny was going on, the Crimean war had but lately ended, and there were still a good many men alive who remembered th Peninsular war and Waterloo. One salon also survived-we refer, of course, to Lady Palmer ston's. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that Mr. Dalias's recollections of England are particularly interesting. They consist mainly of political and social notes, such as might be found in any newspaper of the period and anecdotes either new or striking are much less frequent than in the Russian section of the Diary. We did not need the evidence of the journa to confirm the fact, generally known, that the author was exceptionally popular in London society. The Queen did but reflect the uni versal opinion when, at a council, she single the American Minister out of a group in which he was standing and said to him. " doing a great deal of good at this court. Two such great nations as the United States and England should not quarrel, but remove causes of difference." The truth is, however, that Mr. Dallas was looked upon as half an Englishman, both on account of his many mother were both English subjects when they

came to the United States. When we say that the London portion of this Diary is comparatively prosaic, we do not mean to imply that it is entirely devoid of anec-dotes. Here are two: The author was told at a country house where he went to spend Christmas that Count do M-- announced his intention of marrying in St. Petersburg: the Countess, with whom he had lived for a great many years, sent for her son, about 10, and said to him: "You must avenge my wrong, De M-- is not, as has been supposed, your father, and you must fight him. Your father was Baron --." "Ah!" exclaimed the young ster. "you destroy my happiness. I fondly be "Ah!" exclaimed the young-

lieved myself the son of the Dake do -.. About a year afterward Mr. Dallas was dining at the house of Marshal Pélissier. Duke de Malakoff. The host played the rough sold er pretty broadly, and finally called across the table to tell the American Minister (who on such occasions was exceedingly discreet. not to say demure) a story about one of the United States' envoys in Paris during the Direct tory. The latter was desired, it seems, to give a toast, and did so by proposing "A la santé du boau sexe des deux nemisphères!" Whereupon French General proposed a transposition thus, "A la santé des deux hémisphères du beau sexe!" Mr. Dallas goes on to inform us gravely that this particular feature of a pretty woman's attractions was the Marshal's monomania. He says that the Duke of Wellington. whom he strangely calls" Lord" Wellington. told him that recently at an evening party. while standing behind a lady whose shoulders were unusually disclosed and beautiful, Pelissier put his hand on one of them. Naturally the lady turned in extreme indignation, where-

upon he cried: "Tardon, pardon, le croyal que vous étiez, la Comtesse de W--- !! One of Mr. Dallas's reminiscences will astonish readers of our day who are accustomed to look on Mr. Gladstone as a sober, not to say solemn, person. Dining with Lord Lindhurst, Mr. Dallas heard Gladstone tell a piquant story of what Lord Brougham had said of Sir J. G-, to wit. that he had known his mother very well, and had called to see her shortly after Sir J. was born; that the nurse was ordered to bring the infant in to show him, and, as soon as he came in, he misbenaved himself! "As he has been doing ever since," put in Mr. Effice, who was present, and great laughter followed the sally. Another incident recorded in the "Diary" is more diverting than the author means it to be. It seems that at the door of the room, while the Queen was receiving her visitors one day at a levee, one of the geatlemen was stopped because he insisted on keeping his hat on. For a minute the line was interrupted. Her Majesty and the Prince Consort leaned forward to see the cause and then laughed, of serving that it was the Baron of Kinsale exercising his undoubted hereditary privilege of remaining covered in the presence of his sovereign. Mr. Dallas's superheated comment runs as follows: "One would expect of a civilized nobility that so indecent a privilege would long since have been renounced. In America the hat would have been knocked off the head unscrupulously, but in refined England it is a part of the religion of aristocracy to

find that Mr. Dallas when in London avowed an unquestioning faith in newspapers. We read under date of Dec. 3, 1850: "Talked to Delane of the Times; asked me if I had anything new from the Northwest. I said. Nothing, except by the newspapers. What! You ing, except by the newspapers." read newspapers?' 'Certainly. I get all my knowledge and ideas by them. square myself by every view they take; have faith in them as unerring." About Macaulay and Thackeray we hear next to nothing in this "Diary." nor are we consoled or compensated by learning that once at Lady Palmerston's Mr. Dallas met one Mr. Crossley, an extensive carpet manufacturer of Halifax, Yorkshire, and that some talk concerning the use of carpets in the United States ensued. Mr. Crossley said. we are informed, that more carpeting of the Brussels kind was used in the United States than in Great Britain and Europe put together -aye. twice as much. Mr. Dal'as asked him how he accounted for the fact. He replied that In America carpets were renewed every three or four years: that Americans had a dislike to dingy carpets; that such a worn carpet as Lady Palmerston's, then under their feet, would not be telerated in any gentleman's house in the United States; that on the Continent carpets

were comparatively little used.

We must find space for one more extractthe description of an encounter with a Bostonese victim of professorial megalomania

We read under date of April 4, 1800: "I was yesterday called upon by Prof. He seemed to be under the imof Boston. pression that his fame was universal, and expressed astonishment and indignation that he was not at once recognized as a man of great science and position. It was difficult to convince him that I did not know him, and could not rationally acquiesce in his pretension to represent the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston. 'Have you a letter or line of introduction? 'No.' 'Have you anything to show your authorization by the academy? 'No.' 'Any document with its seal? 'No.' 'Any note or memorandum, written or printed? 'No, I have nothing. There is my visiting card, and I claim by that to be treated as a gentleman of science.' Not to know you, Professor, is my misfortune, which you should not upbraid as a fault. I don't doubt your word; but in approaching the British Government to obtain for you a very valuable set of the geological survey maps. I am not at therty to act upon your word only. Do you know none of the men of science here? 'Yes; Sir Roderick Murchison, Sir Charles Lyall." *Quite enough. Bring me a line from either and I will address Lord John Russell for you.' He left me somewhat appeared, but by no means convinced that I was properly deferential to his attainments and reputation. It is very rare to meet science without an accompaniment of personal modesty; sometimes it so happens. To-day I received a short, neat, and satisfactory assurance from Sir Char'es Lyell, and have therefore felt warranted in asking for the charts."

Some Historical Paradoxes.

It is never too late to ask for a rehearing of cause at the bar of history, and the judgments once recorded that have been set asile ince Niebuhr's time, are beyond numbering Of course, however, an attempt to discredit and reverse a current verdict of the so-called standard historians, must expect to be looked upon at first as a paradox, and only when such cessful can claim a place among orthodox opinions. The views set forth by the Rev. Dr REUREN PARSONS in a little book entitled Some Lies and Errors in History (New Era Office, Notre Dame, Indiana) will seem to many readers paradoxical, although even for them they will have the charm of novelty. In this collection of essays the nuthor, who has manifestly accepted no asser tion at second hand, but has gone for himsel to the original authorities, has undertaken the task of defending Roderick Borgia, Pope Alexander VI., and of eulogizing Louis XI, and Louis XIII., and his researches have led him to conclusions very different from those con monly adopted regarding Bruno and Campanella; the character of Richelleu considere as an ecclesiastic, and the part played in his career by Father Joseph, known as the Grey Cardinal; concerning, also, the na Tasso's imprisonment: the purpose of the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the identity of the man with the iron mask. Dr. l'arsons also offers some interest ing remarks on the alleged ante-morten funeral of Charles V., on the alleged connec tion of St. Cyril of Alexandria with the murde: of Hypatia, on the divorce of Napoleon and Josephine, on the treatment of Galileo by the Holy See, on the pretended utterance am the State." by Louis XIV., and on the relation to the Church of Rome of the Orthodox Russian and the schismatic Greek churches.

What are the grounds for believing that Roderick Llangol, commonly known as Roderick Borgia, who, in 1492, became Pope Alex ander VI., was a monster of wickedness? That is the question which Dr. Parsons examines in his first essay. It is pointed out that the wit nesses against the character of this Pontiff are untrustworthy. They are Burkhard, master of ceremonies in the court of Alexander VI. Guicelardini, the Florentine historian: Paul Jovius, and Tomaso Tomasi, whose evidence is supposed to be corroborated by the so ralled "Relation," a narrative imputed to Paolo Capello, the Venetian Ambassador to Rome from April, 1400, to September, 1500. Dr. Parsons takes up these authorities in turn and scrutinizes their claims to credit. He denie that a master of ceremonies, although possi bly a great dignitary in the eyes of lackeys or the staircase, or in the estimation of dawdler. in the ante-chamber. Is in a position to acquire knowledge of court secrets. Be that as it may the pretensions of Burkhard's diary to authen ticity are very questionable. It was scarcely heard of until two centuries after the date when it purports to have been composed, and not only do the manuscripts differ from one another, but one of them, the fullest, ends a year after the alleged author's death. As for the statement made by Gregorovius, who assailed the memory of Alexander VI. in a book published as late as 1876, that Burk hard never repeats mere rumors, Dr. Parsons shows that this is quite unfounded. There i scarcely a page of the so-called diary on which we do not read, "if I remember aright," or "if the truth has been told me," or "it is said." As for Gulcemrdini, we are reminded that even the skeptical Baylo said that be merited hatred because of his partiality, that Voltaire regarded him as mendacious, and that his own conscience caused him, when asked on his deathbed what disposi-tion should be made of his hi-tory. then still in manuscript, to reply, it." Capefigue pronounces Guicciardini "an impassioned colorist who always breathes hatred of the Pope," and Canta said of him: "He regards the success, not the justice of a cause. He not only examines and judges the Pontiffs as he does other rulers, but he always finds them in the wrong." The truth is that this historian was devoted to the Colonna and Orsini families, and was also a partisan of Savonarola. Naturally, therefore, he was a for to the Porgias. The authority of Paul Jovius is of less value than that of Guicelardini Reproved one day for having narrated falsely, he rejoined. "No matter, three hundred years hence it will be true.' Cantù calls Jovius the "lying gazetter of the epoch." and Vossius said that "for money Jovius would furnish posterity with a good character for any child of earth, but he would calumniate all who did not pay for his services." As for Tomaso Tomasi, it is deemed enough to say that his " Life of Casar Borgia' was written with two objects: one was the fagood will the author thought to secure by de faming the Pontiff whom her brother had antagonized: the other was to exhibit in Casar a type of monstrosity which would exceed the efforts of the most rampant imagination. We come lastly to the so-called "Relation" of Paolo Capello, which has been supposed to confirm the testimony against Alexander VI. collected from other sources. But this narrative, as

Dr. Parsons shows, was written not by Capello but by the Venetian chronicler, Marino Sanuto, who, without knowing anything at first hand of what happened in Rome, undertook to fill the hiatuses in the reports of the Venetian Ambassadors between 1406 and 1533. He was an excessively credulous man, accepting, for instance, the fabulous story of the fluding of the Pope-Ass in the Tiber, and his assertions must therefore be received with caution.

It is certainly difficult to reconcile the pop ular conception of the character of Roderick Borgia with the undisputed facts of his life These are set forth by Dr. Parsons, but at the outset it is admitted that one fault Roderick Borgia had, a fault, that is to say, in a Pope, though it would not be a fault in a layman. He was passionately fond of the children, four sons and a daughter, who are generally supposed to have been born to him, but before he received holy orders. Neither is it denied that to aggrandize his family he made too much use of his son Casar, and thus, in the eyes of posterity, exposed himself to sharing the odium of that son's crimes. The story current till recently with regard to the children was this: That Roderick, while still following the profession of fell in love with a girl who is gener aily known as Vanozza. Tomasi says that Roderick regarded her as his legitimate wife, but if any marriage took place, which seems probable from the fact of her being identified with a Princess Farnese, one of a family not likely to brook an insult, even from a Borgis. it was certainly kept secret. Such was the story that used to be believed, but in 1880 an exhaustive work was published at Bologna, by Leonetti, which undertook to demonstrate that Casar, Lucretia, and the other children were not the offspring of Cardinal Roderick Borgia, but either of some Borgia especially loved by him, or of a brother who remained in Spain, or of a sen of his brother who had held a high office in Rome. When their father had died and Vanozza had remarried, these children were cared for by Roderick. Leonetti's book was highly commended by Leo XIII., and his argumonts soom to Dr. Parsons irrefutais pointed out that the only plausible contradiction offered—that but forward in the Recue des Etudes Historiques for April 1881, was triumphantly rebutted three months later in the Univers. Much stress is naturally laid upon the fact that no proof can be given that Vanozza ever appeared in Rome during Roderick's career there, whether as Cardinal or as l'ope.

11. It is equally hard to reconcile the tra ditional idea of Alexander VI. with the sketch of his life traced by Dr. Parsons in conformity with undisputed facts. Roderick Llancol was born on Jan. 1, 1431, at Xativa, in the provinc of Valencia, in Spain. It was not until his maternal uncle, Alfonso Borgia, was elevated to the Panacy under the name of Callyins III n 1455, that the Llangol family assumed the name and arms of the Borgias, by which they are known in history. From his youth Boderick was conspicuous for talent, and the first profession chosen for him was that of the bar, but he soon left it for the career of arms. Called to Rome by his uncle. and baving evinced great aptitude for the business of a court, Roderick accepted offers of clerical preferment, and was made in rapid succession Commendatory Archbishop of Valencia, Cardinal-Deacon, and Vica-Chancellor of the Roman Church. As to his conduct at this period, a contemporary testifies that his fellow Cardinals were "much pleased to have among them one who surpassed all in an abundance of gifts," and Duvolsi, although a writer most hostile to Alexander VI., admits that during his long Cardinalate of thirty-five years Roderick nover caused any public scan-dal. The manners of Roderick are said to have been strangely fascinating, and even Guiceiardini ascribes to him rare powers of penetration, great tact, and diplomatic talent lames of Volterra and Poter Martyr o Enghiera, although they waste no praise Roderick, recognize in him capacious genius and profundity of thought. Egidius of Viterbo describes his cloquence as natural and irresistible, his activity as indefatigable, and his sobriety as exemplary. Tomasi, a hostile witness, acknowledges that whoever observed the Cardinal could see that his mind marked im for empire.

It was not until 1476 that Roderick, having een appointed Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, reeived holy orders. He had been a Cardinal nearly twenty years, but the reader is warned by Dr. Parsons that if he imagines the children said to have been born to Roderick before this date (there was no born after it to have been necessarily sacrilegious, he is deceived by the title Cardinal which the Pope fers, in accordance with the present discipline of the Church, only upon persons in at least deacon's orders. In Roderick's day, and for some time afterward, the acquisition of the red hat did not always presuppose sacred orders; Mazarin and many other Cardinals never received them. Neither did the Archbishopric of Valencia, conferred on Roderick in his youth, entail upon him the necessity of taking orders. His prelacy was merely "commendatory," that is, he enjoyed the emoluments of the See without discharging

opiscopal functions. It has been maintained that the Conclave of 402, which unanimously elected Roderick Borgia Pope under the name of Alexander VL. was tainted with simony. The charge rests on the rumors, insinuations, and hypothese Burkbard, Infessura. Manfredo Manfredi. The five cardinals who according to Burkhard denounced the alleged simony, all voted for Borgia. Infessura reports that "it is said" that n order to secure the votes of Ascanto Sforza and his friends. Roderick sent during the Couclavo four mules laden with treasure to Sform's palme. A critic of this passage, quoted by Dr. Parsons, remarks that it is strange that the indiscre tion which is said to have revealed this transaction did not betray it to the brigands the were just then in possession of the streets of Rome. Manfredo Manfredi. Ambassador of Ferrara to the court of Florence, pronounces it incredible that the Cardinals Colonna, Savelli, and Orsini would have voted for Borgia. unless seduced by money. The only evidence, however, adduced to support the imputation of simony is an enumeration of the benefices given to these Cardinals by Alexander VI. in mediately after his cuthronization. The evidence is plainly inconclusive, for the places were vacant, and had to be filled. We come. finally, to the story that both Alexander VL and Cosar Borgia were poisoned, the former fatally; that, through either error or treachery, they partook of a deadly drug which they had prepared for certain Cardinals who were hostile to their projects. Ranke credits this report, but Roscoe rejests it, and even Voltaire is firm in ascribing Alexander's death to natural causes. Speak ing of the poison lable. Voltaire said: "All the enemies of the Hoty See have believed this horrible tale: I do not, and my chief rea son is that it is not at all probable. The Pope and his son may have been wicked, but the were not fools. It is certain that the poison ing of a dozen Cardinals would rendered father and son so execrable that nothing could have saved them from the fury of the Romans and all Italy. The crime, too, was directly contrary t the views of Casar. The Pope was on the verge of the grave, and Borgin could cause the election of one of his own creatures; would be gain the Sacred College by murdering a dozen of its members?" The fable is not only unreasonable in itself, but, as Dr. Parsons shows is contradicted by contemporary evidence. In the Ducal Library of Ferrara there is a manuscript bistory by Sardi, a contemporary of Guicelardini, wherein the author speaks of ten letters, written by their agents to Duke

Hercules of Ferrara and the Cardinal d'Este.

in which it is recounted that the Pontiff

by bleeding nor by the use of manns, and he expired on the night we mentioned (Aug. 18).

After death the body became swollen and blackened, owing to the putrefication of the blood; and hence there originated among such as knew not the cause of these appearances, a rumor that the Pope had been poison ed." This account of the cause of the Pope's decease by confirmed in a manuscript Diary. sscribed to Burkhard and preserved in the Corsini Library.

Dr. Parsons discusses briefly one more of the pretended facts brought forward to sustain the theory of Pope Alexander's immor ality. We refer to the revolting orgy said to have been celebrated in honor of the prospec tive marriage of Lucretia with the Duke o Ferrara, a banquet at which we are asked to fancy as participants the aged pontiff. Casar, Lucretia, and fifty "respectables" (honester) prostitutes. The charge rests exclusively on a passage in the true or false Burkhard. and, as Dr. Parsons suggests, the fe male guests must have been Loneste far beyond the wont of their class, and the servants present must have been miracles of secrecy, if all Rome did not ring the next day with echoes of the Bacchanalian revel. As a matter of fact, excepting Burkhard, if indeed it be he who speaks in the passage in question, not one of the chron-iclers who dilate circumstantially on all the festivities given at the Vatican in honor of Lucretia's espousals, says a word about an orgy which would have been a mine of wealth to gossips. How is it possible to account for such reticence on the part of the Ferrarese envoys, who were then residing in the Vatican, awaiting the convenience of Lucretia to conduct her to their royal master as a bride? Why, again, is complete silence preserved on the part of the secret agent, sent by the Marchieness of Mantua. sister of the future bridegroom, who kept his mistress informed as to the most trivial incldents at the Papal court?

III.

Giordano Bruno by the Italian Government exhibits some has reliefs of other "martyrs to truth." such as Huss, Servetus, Arnold of Brescia, and Campanella. In an essay on the subject Dr. Parsons contends that it is by no means certain that Bruno was put to death, and that, at all events, Campanella is improperly associated with him upon the monument because the Papacy, far from persecuting him. rescued him from secular persecution. He was, in other words, not the victim, but the beneflelary of the Inquisition. We will only indicate succinctly some of the grounds for these assertions, which to many readers will seem paradoxical. First as to Bruno, it is undisputed that in 1502 he was arrested by the State Inquisitors of Venice on the charge of heresy: that after six years of imprisonment he was delivered to the Holy Office, or Roman Inquisition, tried (and perhaps) condemned to the stake on Feb. 0, 1000. But was the sentence executed, or, as frequently happened in similar cases, was Brune merely burnt in effigy? They who answer in the affirmarest solely on a letter purporting to come from a learned German, then in Rome, Gaspar Schopp, which describes the execution. Many critics have donied the authenticity of this epistle, and, what is more to the purpose. Schopp stands alone in his assertion. The Roman archives contain documents relating to the trial, but not a word is said of a condemnation, nor is there any account of the execution, whereas in every similar case both of these incidents are set forth in detail. Again, the "Relations" of the foreign Ambassadors resident at the Holy See, which never omitted any such items, make no allusion to the event. Not even in the correspondence of the Venetian Ambassador, the agent of a Government which must have felt an especial interest in the fate of Brune, since it had brought about his downfall, is there any reference to the alleged catastrophe. Nor is this all the negative evidence. Canth cites a MS. of the Medicoan archives, dated at Rome on the very day of Bruno's trial, which parrates the burning of an apostate friar a few days before. Here some mention of Bruno's condemnation would naturally occur, but there is not a word. Finally, the celebrated Friar Paul Sarti, although he never missed an opportunity of attacking what he regarded as Roman intolerance, and although he continued course for many years after the trial of Bruno, never alludes to the alleged fate of the Italian herette. The same silence is observed in Ciacconio, Sandrani. Alfani. Mauno. and Ossat, none of whom was likely to have omitted to notice so important an event had it occurred

So much for Bruno; now for Campanella. she, far from being a heretic, was not Catholic, but an exceedingly intolerant one. He declared that the first error committed during the Lutheran movement was in allowing Luther to live after the Diets of Worms and Augsburg: he advised all governments to telerate no Lutherans within their limits, and maintained that the Calvinistic dogma of prodestination rendered all princes wicked, the cople seditious, and theologians traitors. What happened to Campanella was this; while living in the Neapolitan territory about the beginning of the seventeenth century, he was charged with complicity in a conspiracy organized against Spanish rule. The lay con spirators were hanged, but the inculpated ecclesiastics, Campanella excepted, were assigned to the Inquisition. Apparently the Spanish Vicercy insisted on this exception at the instigation of Campanella's private enemies. At all events, he was confined in the fortress of St. Elmo for twenty-seven years. Again and again the Holy See vainly endeavored to procure his release, and finally, Pope Urban VIII., availing himself of the accusation of magical practices, made against the philosopher, insisted that such a charge placed him within the sole jurisdiction of the Inquisition, and succeeded in obtaining the friar's extradition. Far from being tried, imprisoned, or in any way punished. Campanella was at once enrolled in the Papal household, and an aunual pension was assigned to him. He passed several happy years in flome. In 1034, when the Spanish residents, who continued to detest him. made an attack on a house where he was visiting, he was rescued by the Papal police and by the advice of the Pontiff betook himself to France. There he was received with open arms by Cardinal Richelieu, made a Councillor State, and elected President of the French Academy, which had just been founded. To the day of his death, in 1039, he continually corresponded with Pope Urban VIII. It is certainly difficult to discover in his career any justification for associating Campanella with Bruno among the martyrs to science and the victims of Papal tyranny.

Who was the man with the iron mask? In the paper on this subject Dr. Parsons reviews

the various attempts that have been made to identify the masked personage, and arrives at the conclusion that the mysterious prisoner was Fouquet, superintendent of the finances during the early part of the reign of Louis XIV. It is easier to confute the conflicting hypotheses than to establish this particular theory, but the author undoubtedly presents some strong grounds for his opinion. They coincide for the most part with the arguments adduced by M. Paul Lacroix, and fortified by Barthelemy, but they gain effectiveness from the concise and cumulative way in which they are here set forth. It is brought to our notice, in the first place, that the precautious known to have been taken in guarding Fouquet while at Pignerol were very like those used in regard to the masked prisoner of Sainte-Marguerite and the Bastile. When the Chamber of Justice had condemned Fouquet to perpetual exile, the King, on the ground that there was great danger in allowing the transgressor to leave the kingdom, because of his intimate knowledge of many affairs of State, died of tertian fever, then, as it still often is, rampant in Rome. "Attacked by this fever on Aug. 10 (1703), he was relieved neither with four guards, and in cast dy of M. deSaint-Mars, and under the eachet of a hundred musketeers, he was conducted to the castle of Pignerol. His physician and valet were ted to the same confinement, lest they might be a means of communication between their master and his friends. In the "Instruction" signed by Louis XIV. and given to Saint-Mars for his guidance in the care of the prisoner, he is forbidden to allow Fouquet to communicate with any living person, other than Saint-Mara himself. either by speech, writing, or visit; and the even for a walk. Saint-Mars could furnish im with books, but with only one at a time. and he was ordered to carefully examine each book when he removed it, lest any writing or cipher should be hidden therein. The prisoner, of course, was to have no paper or other means of transmitting messages. He could have a confessor when he desired, but the priest was to be notified only at the moment before hearing what Fouquet had to say, and the same confessor could never hear him twice. Finally Saint-Mars was to keep his Majesty in-

formed as to what the prisoner did.

It is certainly suggestive that all of these ex-

eptional precautions correspond exactly with

those adopted in the case of the Iron Mask. Dr.

Parsons shows, in the second place, that most

of the traditions concerning the mysterious

individual can easily be accommodated to

Fouquet. Take, for instance, that of the plate with writing scratched on it, flung from a window. According to Papon, who got his infor mation from the son of one of the guards, it was not a plate, but a shirt, on which the prisoner had written from one and to the other. This story is compared with two passages concerning Fouquet letters from Louvois to Saint-Mars: "I h in "I have received your letter, as well as the napkin on which M. Fouquet wrote," and, "you may tell him that if he turns his table linea into writing paper, he need not be surprised if you give him no more." Again, all the tokens of respect, the many appliances of refinement, the legant furniture, allowed the masked man The monument recently erected in Rome to of Sainte-Marguerite and the Bastile, were onceded to Fouquet at Pignerol. third place, it is far from certain that Fouquet died in 1080, as was reported. His decease was said to have taken place on March 23 of that year, but the Merrure Galant makes no mention of it, although that journal was careful to record the principal deaths of every month. There is, in fact, not one authentic document to establish the death of a man whose fortune and disgrace had caused such wonder. There is only an enig-matical despatch of the Minister of War, the transmission of a coffin, and an extract from a convent register showing a burial a year afterward. Gourville, who kept up a correspondence with his friend Fouquet to the very ist, makes no reference to the time or place of his death. Even the family of Fouquet were uncertain as to his end. Finally, the diary of M. Dujunea states that "the olden prisoner that Saint-Mars had guarded at Pignerol" was yet in that fortress at the end of August, 1081 (seventeen months after the presumed death of Fouquett, when Saint-Mars passed as Governor to another fortress, taking with him the Iron Mask and one other prisoner whose name is unknown. Dr. Parsons points out that political reasons would account for the determination of Louis XIV. to spread a report of the death of Fouquet, since he would thus deprive the opposition eliques of a pretext for intrigue. It should further be observed that Saint-Mars and Louvois, whenever writing about Fouquet before the date of his alleged death always used the same significant phrase, "my" or "your prisoner," although the ormer had many other prisoners in charge Now, after the first appearance of the mask, both Louvois and Barbezieux adopt phrase. The author reserves for the last the most striking piece of evidence. When the Bastile fell into the hands of the mob on July 14, 1780, search was made at once for some evidence as to the identity of the masked prisoner. A periodical of the day informs that there was found a paper marked 64.380,000 and the words, " Fouquet, coming from the Isles Sainte-Marguerite with an iron mask." Then followed X X X and underneath "Kersadion." When this discovery was made known, people recalled to mind a saying in the supplement to the "Age of Louis XIV. to the effect that Chanillart, Minister of State, had averred that the Iron Mask was "a man who possessed all the secrets of Fouquet."

> Were Napoleon and Josephine legally divorced? Dr. Parsons does not hesitate to answer this question in the negative, thereby, of course, implying that Maria Louisa was not the Emperor's lawful wife, but his concubine. Waiving the inquiry whether the ecclosiastimarriage, was competent, we need only keep in view the point that its decision was based on the assumption that the marriage was canonically invalid. According to the law no ceremony of marriage is valid in lands where the Tridentine decrees on matrimony have been promulgated, unless'it is performed in the presence of the parish priest of one of the parties. Now, the nuptial benediction was pronounced just before the coronation of the Emperor and Empress by Cardinal Fesch in the private apartments of the Empress. Whether any witnesses were present is doubtful, and it is cortain that there was no parish priest. Dr. Parsons believes that these infractions of the canon law were purpose; contrived by Bonaparte in order that he might be able to free himself from Josephine at any moment. He bases his belief upon the fact that, although eight years had passed since the civil marriage, he had persistently rejected his wife's prayers for a religious confirmation of their union. He would not now have consented to receive the nuptial benediction at the hands of Cardinal Fesch had not the Pope, privately informed by Josephine of the non-existence of a religious marriage, refused to crown her till a proper mutrimonfal ceremony had been performed. It seems that when Napoleon insisted on a marriage without witnesses and without the presence of a parish priest, his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, refused to countenance what he rightly asserted would be a mockery of a religious solemnization. Finally he yielded sufficiently to propose recurring to the Pope for the powers needed for dispensing with witnesses and for assuming in his own person the colice of the card of the Tuitories. Namelean acquiesced, not comprehending, apparently, that by racurring to the Postiff, the source of canon law, for a dispensation from the provisions of that law he was cutting from under his feet the only ground on which he could securely stand, and on occupying which he had just resolved. At all events, the Cardinal proceeded to the apartments of Paus VII., and, after stating the difficulty, said, "Most Holy Father, it may be that in the exercise of my duties in this matter I shall need all the powers of your Holiness. ' Very wall," replied the Pontiff; " I

accord them all." In view of these facts, Dr. Parsons submits that the marriage of Napoleon and Josephine was not and could not be legally dissolved. Consequently the relation of Maria Louisa to the Emperor was one of concubin-Louisa to the Emperor was one of concubinage. The sole grounds for the acquiescence of the diocesan tribunal of Paris in the imperial demand for a dissolution of the matrimonial bond, was the non-fulfilment at the religious marriace of the conditions prescribed as essential by the canon laws. But the Roman Pontifi had dispensed with these conditions in this particular case; he had suspended in favor of Napoleon and Josephine the obligatory force of those conditions, just as he does in every case of clandestine matrimony, not otherwise illegitimate, celebrated in the United States and in other countries where the Tridentine decrees have not been promulgated. The marriage performed by Cardinal Fesch, having been valid, could not be runtured. Dr. Parsons challenges the exhibition of an instance where any tribunal calling itself Catholic, whether competent or incompetent, legitimate or lilegitimate, ever pretended to dissolve consummuted Christian matrimony. For an instance of the inflexibility of the Holy See in this regard, the mind of Josephine did not need to travel back six centuries to Philip Augustus and Ingelburga, or to search outside the annals of her husband's family. The case of Jerome Honaratro and his baltimoram Parketon.

THE GREAT SIBERIAN FORESTS. Cloomy Woods for Hundreds of Miles-Siberies Villages and Their Inhabitants St. Peressung, April 25.-The famine in Russia so graphically described by the cleve; roung correspondents, who personally and not without risks visited the remote stricken districts during the late winter and early spring. has now reached such a degree of intensity that many of the more desperate victims voluntarily commit crimes that will call forth an order of arrest and a condemnation to hard labor in Siberia. They calculate that there at east there will be food and daily rations, lowever coarse and meagre. To them Siberia has long been only the mines, the long working hours in eternal night, privations, contine-ment, tortures to be sflently berne under the watchful eye of Russian taskmasters; and yet such is their present distress that it has be

come a sort of promised land of plenty.

In one respect, however, they are matilied in their new view of the country. wholly the land of penal settlements, of tal barous captivity and servitude. It is also the country of langensa forests, of boundless tracts of wild, free life, of wooded expanse compared with which the forests of the troy ernments of Moscow and Vladimir are more copses, although it may take a traveller tweetty-four hours to ride through them.

The Siberian forest begins in reality beyond Tomsk, though at first it offers to the era much the same vegetation, the meagre becomes and aspens sparsely dotted with thin pines and the scraggy underbrush of the lessor woods. It has the same marshy, solden so and the open spaces are likewise intersected by occasional ont fields preceding a misera do hamlet, till a region is reached where cultivation apparently completely ceases, and where the dreary monotony of uninteresting brash and copplet is elversitled by no vestige of labor or hapitation. That such exist is probable, but they are assurely hidden from the outward world in the depths of the woodlands and therefore ignored. The impression upon the stranger is one of unspeakable melancholy caused by the senso of immensity, for it soon becomes impossible to fancy that the forest will ever end; it is limitless, and yet conveys the idea of a prison. Further on betw en Mariusk and Atchins;the great Siberian highway—these characteristics are slightly modified and improved; the coloring becomes righer and more intense; the trees lift themselves in more serviced ranks, and acquire size and breadth; through openings in the mere inxurious foliage glimpses are at times obtainable of the distant castern S.b. rian range vaguely sithouetted on the deep, cold blue of the horizon. The rend now meanders through valleys and gorges between steep ac clivities thickly wooded, but it is, however, only near Krasniack that the impressive and unutterable majesty, power, and stately gloom of the "taiga" is felt in all its desolate grandeur. There it becomes magnificent and strangely verdant; there it has broad open spaces bathed in eternal twilight; impenetrable thickets, wide avenues and nisles, and deep, cold shadows. It stretches in its fathomiess obscurity for thousands of versts to the distant sen; a hundred of these may be passed over at a time without seeing a single human creature; no human foot has ever penetrated to the cen-tre of the taiga. The sombre cadars, the black pines are rarely relieved by the lighter branches of the aspen trees or now and then by the red berries of the wild cherry; more rarely still by the white bloom of some strange looking tall illies, and at long intervals a noiscless stream courses under the overnanging branches. Without an experienced guide and a good horse it would be footbardy in the extreme to venture even upon the trails and roads which are the most frequented and the better known; no stranger could by any possibility find his way in those mysterious and deluding labyrinths; for days no sound is heard; no song of bird or harried trampling of animal; daylight itself is changed and veiled, and when it ceases the clear northern night drops a chill, welrd whiteness over the immedia trunks and motionless branches, while it seems to evoke subtle, penetrating, and aronatic perfumes from the cedars and the place that were not perceptible before. It is at that hour that the taiga sends forth lugubrious sighs that full on the startled our like a mournful wail; nothing else can give an idea of this nocturnal awakening of the Siberian forest, which never changes to gladness. But even the dreariness of these sounds is as nothing compared with the terror of a storm suddenly breaking over it; at its furious onset even the stoutest heart might quail, for it seems then as if the hitaerto dumb and forsaken depths were alway

shelter of some subterranean mine were not preferable to the fateful freedom of the tem pest-tossed tains The Siberian forest has its donizons and vistors: they are the hardy hunters who know that those apparently desert solitudes are in some parts haunted by the reindeer, affording a tempting victim to the bears, who are the obget of their patient pursuit. They track them with heave persevenance and at the period their lives, responsible termining absent from their homes so hong hat winon they return to their villages their nature seems changed, and instead of the siming, singing, laughing, good tempered heasant they used to be, they have become silent, morose and misanthroid.

A Sherlan village differs grantly from a Russian one, and in nothing more than the absones of cultivation. The forest invales the singing street and commoness again at the last of the stragging row of houses; there are no bours, no shods, hardly a patch of kitchen garden; the houses are full to wood, and always i the senter or at the beginning of the village stands the state is in full sharply reliated to the senter or at the beginning of the village stands the state is in full sharply reliated to the settlement, as it marks on on the large of the settlement as it marks on one of the high road to the mines, and is found equilarly at an interval of about thirty versus; it may be encetablished with no other object than to facilitate the transport of convict gangs. This origin, curious in itself, is still discernible in the general construction; the stage proper has been established with no other object than to facilitate the transport of convict gangs. This origin, curious in itself, is still discernible in the general construction; the stage proper has buildings have but one; it is also the oldest-looking house in the place, as pullsades being blackened with against exposure the oldest-looking house in the place, as pullsades being blackened with against exposure the first pullsage them to not provide an advantage they concerned with the stage and have either seculations and the content of the oldest-looking house in the place, as pullsades being blackened with against exposure the relationship of the village; they are not shown to the form of the pullsage that they are not should be a december of the content of the content of the pullsage that the content of t

with wild and flerce beasts, roaving and how)-

ing in search of some prey to devour. At such

imes, like the famine-stricken peasant of far

off Russia, the traveller wonders whether the